

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 59, 61-66, 68-73, and 75-79 are pending in the application, with 59, 66, and 73 being the independent claims. Claims 60, 67, and 74 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. These changes are believed to introduce no new issues that would require further consideration and/or search, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 59, 62, 64, 66, 69, 71, 73, 76, and 78 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being allegedly anticipated by Hughes et al. U.S. Patent 6,282,268 (Hughes).

Claims 60, 61, 63, 65, 67, 68, 70, 72, 74, 75, 77, and 79 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Hughes in view of Houser et al. U.S. Patent 5,774,859.

The subject matter of previously presented claims 60, 67, and 74 has been incorporated into amended independent claims 59, 66, and 73 respectively.

The combination of Hughes and Houser does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants amended independent claims 59, 66, and 73. The Office Action acknowledges that Hughes fails to disclose "transmitting a control signal to the remote device, the control signal for directing an action in the remote device." However, the Office Action alleges that Houser meets this limitation. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Houser describes a terminal unit 16 that receives speech data from a user, recognizes the speech as commands for controlling device 18, and generates a command for controlling device 18. (column 5 line 62 to column 6, line 3 Figure 1). In Houser, terminal unit 16 receives speech data from a user and generates a command for controlling device 18. The user speech data is not received from controlling device 18. Thus, Houser does not teach or suggest "a communication module operable to receive input from the remote device...[and] to transmit a control signal to the remote device," as recited in amended independent claim 59. Houser also does not teach or suggest "receiving an audio input from a remote device...and transmitting a control signal to the remote device," as recited in amended independent claims 66 and 73.

For at least these reasons, amended independent claims 59, 66, and 73 are patentable over the combination of Hughes and Houser. Claims 61-65, 68-72, and 75-79 each depend on one of the independent claims discussed above. For at least these reasons and further in view of their own features dependent claims 61-65, 68-72, and 75-79 are patentable over the combination of Hughes and Houser. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are therefore respectfully requested.

Conclusion


All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for

allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Lori A. Gordon
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 50,633

Date: January 14, 2000

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

769299_1.DOC